



Flood Control District of Maricopa County

Flood Control Advisory Board

Meeting Minutes for December 5, 2007

Board Members Present: Hemant Patel, Acting Chairman; DeWayne Justice; Kent Cooper, Secretary; Ray Acuna, Ex Officio; Paul Cherrington, Ex Officio

Board Members Absent: Melvin Martin, Chairman; Scott Ward

Staff Members Present: Timothy S. Phillips, P.E., Chief Engineer and General Manager; Paul Paulsen, General Counsel; Greg Jones, Amir Motamedi, Linda Mardian, Joe Tram, Don Rerick, Tom Renckly, Doug Williams, Greg Watts, Felicia Terri, Chuck Woosley, Mike Wilson, Michael Duncan, and Anna Medina, Clerk of the Flood Control Advisory Board

Guests Present: Ashley Couch, City of Scottsdale; Dan Worth, City of Scottsdale; Brent Emmertan, CVL; Scott Strosnider, City of Scottsdale; Jason Kelly, PSOMA; Jon Girand, Huitt Zollars

1) PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

2) CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Patel called the meeting of the Flood Control Advisory Board (FCAB) to order at 2:00 p.m. on Wednesday, December 5, 2007.

3) APPROVE THE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 24, 2007

ACTION: It was moved by Mr. Justice and seconded by Mr. Cooper to approve the minutes as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

4) FISCAL YEAR 2008/2009 CAPITAL IMPROVEMEMNT PROGRAM (CIP) PRIORITIZATION PROCEDURE RESULTS

Presentation given by: Amir Motamedi, Hydrology/Hydraulics Branch Manager

Guest: Dan Worth, City of Scottsdale

PURPOSE: **ACTION REQUIRED:** To determine whether the Flood Control Advisory Board (FCAB) should endorse staff's recommendations for the FY 08/09 Prioritization Procedure and the performance of candidate assessment reports, pre-design analyses and other actions necessary for the projects to be included in a future CIP budget.

Scottsdale

DISCUSSION: Mr. Justice said if I hear you right, we're going to change the percentage, but we're still going to be looking at somewhere in the \$20 million figure as the District share? Mr. Worth responded that as it stands right now, that's correct, although we are continuing to explore increasing our potential cost share from any other agencies, in particular the community. Mr. Justice said I don't think our intent was to up the overall price, but rather to lower the dollars we were spending. Mr. Worth replied that it was somewhat of a backwards way to get to the 50 percent cost share. It is an accurate reflection of the project costs and that is one of the things that we decided to do after some of the discussions we had with your staff in order to prepare it properly with other projects or right-a-way cost as available project requirements. We've done our best to incorporate that. Mr. Patel asked, how much of the cost estimate is rebuilding the road? I would imagine with a box culvert down there, it would require a fair amount of road construction – or reconstruction. Mr. Worth said we intend to build this project in conjunction with an already-scheduled road widening project that's funded through the Proposition 400 regional program and by doing it that way, we're going to put the road costs on the road project and the flood control costs on the flood control project to minimize, if not absolutely eliminate, using flood control funding for any of the transportation costs or road reconstruction costs. Mr. Cherrington said I'm confused on what it is we would be approving. Are we approving an 83 percent cost share, with you hoping to reduce it to 50/50 on a higher number, or what are we approving? Mr. Phillips answered that you're approving a project worth considering putting on the list. The cost share is not part of your approval, because that'll be subject to the intergovernmental agreement, ultimately, so really the cost share that is proposed is really not part of the approval. That the project has merits and is worth having further consideration of and looking at more detail, ultimately leading to an IGA, is what you're approving. Mr. Cooper said I guess one of the questions I would have is this project can't be built in phase [inaudible]. Mr. Worth responded that we have some limited opportunity for phasing and I recognize the concern about taking this big of a hit in one year. We have some flexibility, I think, as far as phasing the payments, in addition to some limited opportunity to phase the actual construction. There are significant segments of this that are south of the projected road project, so we won't be tied to that schedule and we can break them out and do them in a different funding year. So we can do some substantial things, I think, to lessen the impact on the single-year CIP program. Mr. Motamedi asked if there were more questions. There were none. Mr. Worth said thank you.

City of Phoenix

DISCUSSION: Mr. Justice said on the [inaudible] FEMA floodplain, is that supposed to cure that problem? Mr. Motamedi answered no, sir. There's going to be a 10-year protection, so the floodplain may shrink a little bit, but it's not going to take it away. So this is only a 10-year project that's being proposed. Mr. Patel

asked if there was further discussion. Mr. Phillips said Mr. Chairman, members of the board, I think I'd like to add one comment to the presentation. Just because you all approved it doesn't necessarily mean it immediately ends up in the five-year CIP, and I think that's sometimes a misunderstanding that we have with our project partners. This process just gets it through the approval level and into the mix. Then it's a matter of negotiating IGAs and cost share, and the merits of the project, which will ultimately define with the cost share is and where it sits in the five-year CIP.

ACTION: It was moved by Mr. Justice and seconded by Mr. Cherrington to approve the item as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

5) EAST MESA DRAINS

Presentation given by: Michael Duncan, Project Manager

PURPOSE: **ACTION REQUIRED:** To determine whether the Flood Control Advisory Board should endorse and recommend that the Board of Directors adopt Resolution FCD 2007R011, for authorizing the design, preparation of construction documents, acquisition of additional rights-of-way or easements, utility relocations, and the construction for the East Mesa Drains – Reach 4 and Reach 7 – Channel Improvements.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Patel asked, do we have any feel for how much more there is of this kind of stuff needed around the Valley? Mr. Phillips responded, Mr. Chairman, members of the board, the East Mesa Drains and this region – the ones Mike showed you – were probably the most significant ones. The only other place that we have this type of issue is the Sun City Drains. They're already much more improved and don't present the same sort of issue. Beyond that, I don't know of any other of these sort of a nominal-type drainage features that have been deeded to the county that really convey significant water. Mr. Justice asked, what do you think you're going to do as far as mitigating the problems? Mr. Duncan answered that we're looking at economical hard-lining. We're still at the concept level. We're going to kick around some concepts and get something that's durable but inexpensive. It'll range from gunnite lining to a regular thickness of concrete. Mr. Patel asked if we will we have to rebuild a lot of fencing? Mr. Duncan said the problem is the fencing is private fencing, so we're going to try to build that slope so our construction will not have to dig down and hold the fencing up during our construction. We're trying to work up a solution where we add fill, hard-line it and hopefully not replace the fencing.

ACTION: It was moved by Mr. Justice and seconded by Mr. Cherrington to approve the item as submitted. The motion carried unanimously

6) COMMENTS FROM THE CHIEF ENGINEER AND GENERAL MANAGER

Mr. Phillips said you had asked collectively a few questions last month. Really, two questions. One was how much funding is being spent on the landscaping

aspects of our business. Looking back through our last 11 most recent construction projects, the landscaping average is about 5.9 percent of the total bid. The second question was how much are construction costs trends affecting the District. This is a little bit harder to compare apples to apples, but I can tell you that out of those 11 projects, the low bid versus the engineering estimate is about 84 percent of that, and the high bid is 115 percent. It really varies project-to-project on whether it's all over, all under, or somehow split. If we look at E&R from July '06 to July '07, they're saying that the cement costs are up 2.8 percent, construction is up 4.7 percent, construction equipment is up 2.5 percent, and pipe fittings are down 2.1 percent. The difficulty we have in trying to make that relationship with ours is how the bids are submitted. We're only really able to look at it kind of holistically, because of all the different sizes of pipe, different for each of the projects, we have been doing very well as far as our engineering estimates versus the bids on the projects. They typically, or almost in all cases, have run below what the engineering estimate was, and I am guessing we will start to see more and more of that as the competition for this type of work increases. Mr. Patel asked, is there any particular sensitivity to fuel costs? Mr. Phillips said not that we could pull out of the bids, specifically. I don't have anything else, so I'll ask Jon if you have any comments. Mr. Girard said he had no comments. Mr. Patel asked, how did we do with all the rain we had last week? Mr. Phillips said we had some structures that obviously picked up water but it was all managed. I understand there were a few folks that drove around some barricaded washes and I think they will be taken care of by those who rescued them. Beyond that almost 49 years of infrastructure has served us well. Mr. Cherrington said that I'll just report from the Salt River Project's standpoint, we received about over 50,000 acre feet of new storage in reservoirs on the river. Horseshoe, for example, came up 30 feet. We have a qualitative precipitation forecast for the storms coming Friday and Saturday for two inches on the watershed, and we're concerned about having to spill on the Verde River. Mr. Phillips said our projections for in town are more within Maricopa County as opposed to up on the watersheds, but we're expecting to see quite a bit less rain in town. It'll be mostly along the hills to the north. Most of the flows that we saw were in the Cave Creek and New River areas, basically coming out of the hills. We're looking forward to another rain event.

No Action Required.

7) SUMMARY OF RECENT ACTIONS

No additional comments were made.

8) OTHER BUSINESS AND COMMENTS

No additional comments were made.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:10 p.m.